

great aversion to anything like personal controversy in the columns of a newspaper, and do not think that Mr. Sharpe was justified in introducing my name. But as this has been done I am bound to defend my publications by showing the very slight grounds he has for his attack. I believe the reputation of the "Glossary of Architecture" is too well established to be injured by Mr. Sharpe's interested attacks. It is evident that he judges of others by himself in at once attributing unworthy motives to the letters of "P. S. A." but he was not justified in his attack upon the "Glossary," even if his conjectures were correct. By his own showing he has referred only to an edition of the work, published ten years ago. The interval has been one of rapid progress in the study of Mediæval Architecture, and if Mr. Sharpe has succeeded in detecting a few errors amongst a multitude of dates, he might have had the candour to acknowledge that some allowance should be made for those ten years. But further, the particular part of the work to which he has confined his quotation, the "Chronological Table," has not been published in the last edition, and has been suffered to remain out of print for the last six or seven years, because I saw that it required more careful revision than I have had time or opportunity to give to it. Every one who has used the "Glossary," and the number is probably larger than Mr. Sharpe imagines, must be aware that it contains two classes of dates, one for which there is historical evidence, the other conjectural, distinguished by having A.D. annexed to the first class, and circa or c. to the second: no pretension was ever made to exact accuracy with regard to the latter class, and a variation of ten years in a conjectural date may very well be allowed:—it is probable that a large building would be more than ten years in progress. I believe that in the generality of cases there is as good authority for my conjectural dates, as for Mr. Sharpe's conjectural restorations in his *Parallels*; and there is this distinction between them, that whereas mine are avowedly conjectural, Mr. Sharpe makes no distinction between his own conjectures, some of which are very bold, and the actual remains; so that good deal of care, and the comparison of several plates, is required to distinguish between what is genuine and what is conjectural. Mr. Sharpe is a professional architect, and no doubt feels very confident that his conjectures are perfectly true. I do not pretend to have any such implicit confidence in him. I am neither an architect nor a professor of architecture, but have merely endeavoured to collect the best information I could upon the subject, either from books or from the highest living authorities, those who are known to have paid the most attention to the subject, and whose judgment is most to be relied on. The information so collected I have endeavoured to lay before the public in a popular form, and I have reason to believe that I have been tolerably successful. I regret extremely that he has compelled me to enter into these particulars. I agree with my friends Mr. Scott and Mr. Freeman in having a high esteem for Mr. Sharpe's labours, and am not conscious of having given him any just cause of offence. I believe that the "Chronological Table," which he has attacked, was, at the time it was published, a fair reflex of the opinion of the best informed persons on those subjects, although after the lapse of ten years considerable changes may now be necessary in the conjectural parts of it. Ten years ago it was the general belief that the deeply-recessed Norman doorways, such as those of Ilfey Church, were generally built in the middle of the 12th century; but subsequent researches have changed that opinion, and it is now believed that they were generally built after that period. I endeavoured to point out this change of opinion in a paper in the *Archæological Journal*, 1847, which Mr. Sharpe appears not to have seen. I believe that the authority for the date of Ilfey Church as there given will be found to be better than he imagines. I am informed that the original register of the church is preserved in the British Museum, and also a survey of the manor (Ilfey) at the beginning of the reign of Henry II., in

which no church is mentioned, as would have been the case if there had been one. The next blot in my table which Mr. Sharpe has hit is that I had called the Pointed arch a sign of Transition, without sufficiently qualifying the general rule. But even then I mentioned the use of late mouldings at the same time, and it might be inferred that the Pointed arch alone, without late mouldings, is no proof of Transition. Mr. Rickman had observed long before that "round and pointed arches were, for nearly a century, used indiscriminately, as was most consonant to the necessities of the work or the builder's ideas." This observation has not been sufficiently attended to. My own experience fully confirms it; and further, I have found in the south and west of France a large class of important buildings of the eleventh century, in which the pointed arch is commonly used. S. Front, at Perigueux, may be considered as the type. This was founded in 984, and consecrated in 1047; and the series of cupolas by which it is vaulted are all carried upon pointed arches, which must, therefore, be part of the original construction. There are at least forty other churches in the same district (Perigord) copied from this. The church and cloister of Moissac have original inscriptions, giving the date of 1100 for the completion of the work, and have pointed arches in the original structure. In both these cases, and in several others, there is additional work of later Norman character built against the original fabric, and this addition is of the character of the middle of the twelfth century. There is not a better authenticated date to be found than that of the Crusaders' Church at Jerusalem, because they only held possession of the city for a very few years, and the building of the church is a matter of history too notorious to be disputed. I am surprised at the coolness with which Mr. Sharpe asserts that the arches of this church are round, and appeals to his friend Professor Willis to confirm his assertion. I believe I have an equal right to appeal to the personal friendship of the learned Professor; but I do not consider such an appeal as a fair way of deciding such a question. I prefer to appeal to his published work on the subject "The Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem," 1849, p. 86. "The present choir, furnished with its circumambulating aisle and radiating chapels, was erected to the east of it, in the form then employed in many parts of western Europe, and with pointed arches."

He mentions these pointed arches again repeatedly, as at pp. 88, 99, 93, &c., and in the engravings accompanying the work, they are distinctly represented as pointed. These arches must have been built about the year 1100; they are not of Saracenic character, but in the usual style of that part of Europe from which the expedition sailed, at that period. Bordeaux was the port of embarkation; and the examples I have mentioned are all in the province of Aquitaine, and must have been seen by the crusaders on their way; indeed, many of them came from that very district. There is, therefore, no great improbability in the account given by the local historians, that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Northampton, with its pointed arches, was built by Simon de St. Liz, the second Earl of Northampton, on his return from this crusade, especially as these arches are perfectly plain, and have no mouldings or other details of late character. It is probable, also, that many other buildings in England, which have been assumed to belong to the period of Transition on account of the use of pointed arches only, are really of a much older date. It is necessary to examine the mouldings and details in this as in all other cases. The pointed arch alone is no proof of late date.

Perhaps I may be allowed now to turn the tables upon Mr. Sharpe, and give another reason for not upsetting our well-established and true system to adopt his new one. He avows that his own system is totally inapplicable to France or other foreign countries, and says that no other system can be applied to both English and foreign examples. This I altogether deny. There are, of course, provincialisms, or nationalisms, to be taken into ac-

count and allowed for, but the eye soon becomes accustomed to these, just as, in our own country, we must make allowance for the difference between Yorkshire and Devonshire. But the leading features of the established system—the division into four great periods or styles—is just as well marked on the continent as in England. This system is not only applicable, but is actually applied, and in daily use, all over Europe. Its great recommendation is its simplicity, and the ease with which it is remembered; while the seven divisions of Mr. Sharpe's system are perfectly arbitrary, and applicable (so far as they can be applied at all) to England only: the four divisions of the established system are natural and obvious, and have this great advantage, of agreeing with the four centuries during which these styles prevailed, the last quarter of each century being the period of transition from one style to the other, and during these periods there was not only a mixture of styles, but also what Professor Willis has aptly called, an "overlapping of styles;" that is to say, during these periods, while new-fashioned people built in the new style, old-fashioned people continued to build in the old style. Some districts were in advance of others. But with these qualifications the same general style prevailed all over Europe. The style of the thirteenth century, for instance, which in England is the "Early English Gothic," and in France is the "Early French Gothic," has a marked and decided character of its own, which no one who has studied architecture at all can possibly mistake, but which is not always distinguished by lancet windows either in England or in France. The question is not when the first germ of a new style began to make its appearance, but when it became established, and the usual style of the period. It is here that Mr. Sharpe's system entirely fails. Cross the Channel, and his "Periods" must be left behind.

On this subject I will venture to set my own experience against Mr. Sharpe's. I have been in the habit of travelling on the continent every summer for the last twenty years,—in Germany, Holland, Belgium, and France (latterly I have confined my tours to particular districts of France), and, with the help of the established English system, I have been able to tell the age of foreign buildings with nearly the same facility as English ones. In the best foreign works upon the subject, it will be found that their system is the same as our own. I have also had the pleasure of being personally acquainted for many years with M. De Clamont, the author of the best French works on the subject, and find his system the same as our own. Through him I have become acquainted with many of the leading antiquaries of France, and, at his request, have been for some years a member of the society of which he is the able president—have attended several of their meetings, and joined in their excursions. I find no difficulty in conversing with them, and discussing with them the dates, or the merits, or the uses of the various buildings we have met with, or which happened to be mentioned. My opinion is as frequently asked as that of any other member. In one instance, at least, it was my good fortune to be able to explain, from my English experience, the use of an important building which had previously been mistaken by all the French antiquaries—the remarkable kitchen of the Abbey of Fontevault. This sort of friendly intercourse between those engaged in kindred pursuits in different countries I hold to be very desirable and useful to both parties; but if compelled to adopt Mr. Sharpe's system, it would be impossible for me to continue it, and necessary to abandon the acquaintance and correspondence of my friends in France. No one who has studied Gothic architecture by Mr. Sharpe's system only, can ever hope to establish a similar correspondence, or even to understand anything of foreign Gothic. Suppose a tyro to have just learned Mr. Sharpe's system, and to make an excursion to Paris; he naturally goes to the cathedral of Notre Dame, and finding all the windows agree with Mr. Sharpe's vague definition of the "Geometrical Period," he assigns the